

against taxpayer-funded abortion that had enjoyed consistent bipartisan support for decades.

So, Madam President, this isn't just a runaway pricetag; these policies themselves are terrible—terrible policies—destructive things that would make America's families' lives actually worse. And the end goal, as one liberal House Member said just yesterday, is a Medicare for All system from before you are born until you die—from before you are born until you die.

More government between families and affordable care. More government between sick patients and lifesaving cures. More reckless ideas from Washington Democrats.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Madam President, now on one final matter, earlier this week during a trip to South America, Secretary of State Blinken said that “undermining the independence of the courts” and “packing courts” were among “the ways that democracies can come undone.” This is the Secretary of State during a trip to South America. His warning was apparently directed to neighbors in our hemisphere, but ironically—ironically—his own fellow Democrats here in Washington, DC, apparently need the same lecture.

Last week, President Biden's much-ballyhooed Commission tasked with studying potential changes to the makeup of the U.S. Supreme Court issued its first findings. In some corners of the radical left, there was predictable disappointment that it had not more explicitly fed the flames.

But let's be clear: The mere creation of this Commission was itself a clumsy act of political thuggery against judicial independence, and what it did seem to support—slapping term limits on Supreme Court Justices—is no less of a radical affront to the principles on which the Court was established.

So, Madam President, curtailing the tenure of our Nation's senior-most judges is such an obvious threat to judicial independence, it has literally been warned about since our Nation's founding. Here is what Alexander Hamilton had to say about it—and he didn't mince any words—in Federalist 78. He warned that the judiciary is “in continual jeopardy of being overpowered, awed or influenced by its coordinate branches; and that as nothing can contribute so much to its firmness and independence, as permanency in office”—permanency in office—“this quality may therefore be justly regarded as an indispensable ingredient in its constitution.”

This is Alexander Hamilton, Madam President—“an indispensable ingredient”—Alexander Hamilton on life tenure for judges. Our Founders insisted on it because they knew that the branches of government with the powers to write and execute laws would be tempted to undermine the branch that could exercise nothing but its judgment.

To an alarming degree in recent years, we have seen Democrats in both

the executive and the legislative succumb to exactly the temptation that Alexander Hamilton warned us about, from the brazen amicus brief from a group of our Senate colleagues warning the Court to “heal itself” lest it be “restructured,” to the bizarre verbal threats issued by the Democratic leader on the steps of the Court, naming Justices who would “pay the price” for failing to rule the way he wanted, to the pseudoacademic Commission the President created to consider reanimating the ugly cadaver of court packing that his party last tried 80 years ago.

So, Madam President, these are nonsense responses to a nonexistent problem. The real problem is the shameful depths to which Democrats are apparently willing to stoop in pursuit of brute power. As I have said before, sensible people of all political stripes have an obligation to condemn this behavior. But the most embarrassing condemnation of these tired tactics? Our Founders saw it coming centuries in advance.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 254, Tana Lin, of Washington, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Washington.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher Murphy, Amy Klobuchar, Debbie Stabenow, Martin Heinrich, Edward J. Markey, Patty Murray, Tina Smith, Tammy Baldwin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Brian Schatz, Tim Kaine, Alex Padilla, Tammy Duckworth, Richard Blumenthal, Jacky Rosen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Tana Lin, of Washington, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Washington, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 421 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Blumenthal	Brown
Bennet	Booker	Cantwell

Cardin	King	Sanders
Carper	Klobuchar	Schatz
Casey	Leahy	Schumer
Collins	Lujan	Shaheen
Coons	Manchin	Sinema
Cortez Masto	Markey	Smith
Duckworth	Menendez	Stabenow
Durbin	Merkley	Tester
Gillibrand	Murkowski	Van Hollen
Graham	Murphy	Warner
Hassan	Murray	Warnock
Heinrich	Ossoff	Warren
Hickenlooper	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hirono	Peters	Wyden
Kaine	Reed	
Kelly	Rosen	

NAYS—47

Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hagerty	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Capito	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Lummis	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Young
Fischer	Portman	

NOT VOTING—1

Feinstein

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 47.

The motion is agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 187, Douglas L. Parker, of West Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Sheldon Whitehouse, Ben Ray Lujan, Martin Heinrich, Cory A. Booker, Jack Reed, Joe Manchin III, Richard J. Durbin, Mazie Hirono, Christopher A. Coons, Richard Blumenthal, Jacky Rosen, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Gary C. Peters, Chris Van Hollen, Robert P. Casey, Jr.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Douglas L. Parker, of West Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or change their vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 422 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Peters
Bennet	Hirono	Portman
Blumenthal	Kaine	Reed
Booker	Kelly	Rosen
Brown	King	Sanders
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cardin	Leahy	Schumer
Carper	Lujan	Shaheen
Casey	Manchin	Sinema
Collins	Markey	Smith
Coons	Menendez	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Tester
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Gillibrand	Murray	Warren
Hassan	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Padilla	Wyden

NAYS—47

Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Romney
Blunt	Hagerty	Rounds
Boozman	Hawley	Rubio
Braun	Hoeven	Sasse
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Cramer	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	Lummis	Toomey
Cruz	Marshall	Tuberville
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Paul	

NOT VOTING—2

Feinstein Van Hollen

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 47.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Douglas L. Parker, of West Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 338, Myrna Perez, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit.

Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Sheldon Whitehouse, Ben Ray Lujan, Martin Heinrich, Cory A. Booker, Jack Reed, Richard J. Durbin, Mazie Hirono, Christopher A. Coons, Richard Blumenthal, Jacky Rosen, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Gary C. Peters, Chris Van Hollen, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Michael F. Bennet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Myrna Perez, of New York, to be

United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or change their vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 423 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Peters
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Kaine	Rosen
Booker	Kelly	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Lujan	Sinema
Casey	Manchin	Smith
Coons	Markey	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Tester
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murkowski	Warner
Gillibrand	Murphy	Warnock
Graham	Murray	Warren
Hassan	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Padilla	Wyden

NAYS—48

Barrasso	Fischer	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hagerty	Romney
Boozman	Hawley	Rounds
Braun	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Collins	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Lummis	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Young

NOT VOTING—1

Feinstein

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 51, the nays are 48.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Myrna Perez, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

VOTING RIGHTS

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, yesterday, the U.S. Senate was once again presented with the opportunity to protect the will and the voices of the American people. We had a chance to protect the sanctity of our electoral processes and to preserve our democracy. We had a chance to extend voting rights. But yesterday, for the second time this year, Republicans unambiguously chose obstruction over debate, suppression over representation.

All Democrats agree: The Freedom to Vote Act is commonsense legislation.

It would enhance access to the ballot for all Americans—a right enshrined in our Constitution. It would enact badly needed election integrity reforms and eliminate emerging threats to our democracy. The Freedom to Vote Act would put in place key voter protections, such as automatic voter registration, making election day a holiday, and uniform early voting. It includes provisions that are broadly popular with the American people: ending partisan gerrymandering and removing special interest money from our politics.

Every single Democrat voted for this bill. Democrats are united behind voting rights. Yesterday, we came to the floor together, ready to start the debate.

My Republican colleagues have said that Democrats are attempting to frame voting restrictions as voter suppression, implying that voter suppression is some figment of our imagination, a figment of the imagination of those across the country who are suffering from these practices. Well, to my Republican colleagues, look around. Nineteen States have passed 33 new laws this year that make it harder to vote. We know that these laws disproportionately disenfranchise Black voters, Brown voters, immigrant voters; voters like a mother in Georgia, who can't vote because she can't take time off from the job she works to cover the bills in the midst of a pandemic; or the poll worker in Arizona, who was arrested—arrested—for giving a bottle of water to a woman waiting in extreme heat to vote; or the person in Texas, who couldn't vote because he didn't have a ride to the polls.

Stories like these are not exaggerations. They are facts, and they are unconscionable facts. If Congress does not step up to the plate on voting rights, then we are signaling to every person in this country that their voice does not matter. We are telling them that we are a country that cares about representation for some but not for all in our country.

Ensuring voting rights is how we show, no matter a person's background or race or hometown or economic status, that their voice can be heard and represented. Not just the wealthy, not just big corporations, not just White Americans—everybody in our country is fully protected so that they can vote, so they can express that central right in our country.

Inaction on voting rights is not an option. Voting rights are the people's power, and the people's power is how we unlock opportunity, representation, and justice for everyone in our Nation. Ensuring the right to vote is how we restore faith in our democracy and how we turn popular opinion into legislative action here on the floor of the Senate.

This is how we take action to save our planet from the existential threat of the climate crisis that is impacting us right now. This is how we take action to respond to the ongoing COVID—